4 IN RE

No. C 07-03085 SBA

ALEXIS MAGER LAKUSTA,

ORDER

Debtor.

Lakusta, who has been declared a vexatious litigant by the bankruptcy court, has filed in federal district court since May of 2006, all of which appear to arise from, in one fashion or another, an underlying bankruptcy ruling Lakusta considers unfavorable. *See In re Alexis Mager Lakusta*, C 06-03431-SBA (filed May 26, 2006); *Lakusta v. Evans et al*, C 06-06105-PJH (filed September 29, 2006); *Lakusta v. US Trustee*, C 07-00227-SBA (filed January 12, 2007); *Lakusta v. Simms*, 07-05161-JSW (filed October 9, 2007).

The instant bankruptcy appeal appears to be the fourth of five cases that debtor Alexis Mager

The initial bankruptcy appeal was dismissed without prejudice by this Court because, after being granted two extensions to file his opening brief, Lakusta failed to perfect the record and filed an unintelligible opening brief. *See In re Alexis Mager Lakusta*, C 06-03431-SBA, Docket No. 25. In *Lakusta v. US Trustee*, C 07-00227-SBA, the Court denied Lakusta's "emergency" request to place the briefing schedule on hold in that action and ordered Lakusta to file an opening brief by July 16, 2007, or be prepared to show cause why the case should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute. *See Lakusta v. US Trustee*, C 07-00227-SBA, Docket Nos. 21 & 22. Because Lakusta failed to file an opening brief, that case was dismissed for failure to prosecute on September 25, 2007.

¹See In re Lakusta, 2007 WL 2255230 (N.D. Cal. August 3, 2007) (affirming bankruptcy court's September 8, 2006 order in adversary case no. 03-3549 TC (Chapter 7 case no. 02-31521 STC) declaring Lakusta a vexatious litigant).

6

8

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

24

25

On November 6, 2007 – nearly five months after this case was initially filed – the Court ordered Lakusta to file an opening brief by no later than December 5, 2007. Specifically in light of Lakusta's repeated history of requesting extensions to file opening briefs, the order unambiguously stated: "If appellant fails to file a brief by this date, this case will be dismissed for failure to prosecute." See Docket No. 14 at 1 (emphasis in original).

True to form, rather than file an opening brief, and in direct violation of this Court's order, on December 5, 2007, Lakusta filed an "Application for Extension of Time to File Opening Brief," "Judge Armstrong's order not withstanding." Docket No. 15 at 1. The gravamen of this motion appears to be that Lakusta has so multiplied the proceedings related to the underlying bankruptcy case (he has, by his own tally, one appeal pending before the California Court of Appeal, two appeals pending before this Court, and two appeals pending before the United States Court of Appeals for Ninth Circuit) that he cannot keep up with the briefing schedule in all of them. However, while Lakusta states that "an extension of time to file and serve his opening brief in this appeal is not unreasonable in light of the concurrent filing deadlines in immediately related cases," Lakusta identifies no such "concurrent filing deadlines," and, in any case, Lakusta was afforded nearly six months from the date he filed the instant appeal to file an opening brief.

Despite the Court's admonition that if he failed to timely file an opening brief this case would be dismissed, Lakusta failed to timely file an opening brief. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the judgment of the Bankruptcy Court is AFFIRMED. Lakusta's bankruptcy appeal is dismissed, this time WITH PREJUDICE. The Clerk shall close the file and terminate any pending matters.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

23

Dated: 1/10/08

United States District Judge

26

27

1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE
3	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
4	IN RE: ALEXIS MAGER LAKUSTA,
5	Case Number: CV07-03085 SBA Plaintiff,
6	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE v.
7	IN RE: ALEXIS MAGER LAKUSTA et al,
8	Defendant.
9	
10	I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California.
11	
12	That on January 10, 2008, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing said copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositing
13	said envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery receptace located in the Clerk's office.
14	U.S. Bankruptcy Court, No. District of CA (San Francisco)
15 Clerk's Office	
16	P.O. Box 7341 San Francisco, CA 94120-7341
17	U.S. Trustee
18	Office of the U.S. Trustee/SF
19	235 Pine Street San Francisco, CA 94104
20	Alexis Mager Lakusta 1259 El Camino Real #245
21	Menlo Park, CA 94025
22	Thomas E. Coulson
23	Thomas E. Carlson U.S. Bankruptcy Judge
24	USBC-San Francisco 235 Pine St
25	P.O. Box 7341 San Francisco, CA 94104
26	Data di January 10, 2009
27	Dated: January 10, 2008 Richard W. Wieking, Clerk
28	By: LISA R CLARK, Deputy Clerk

4 IN RE

No. C 07-03085 SBA

ALEXIS MAGER LAKUSTA,

ORDER

Debtor.

Lakusta, who has been declared a vexatious litigant by the bankruptcy court, has filed in federal district court since May of 2006, all of which appear to arise from, in one fashion or another, an underlying bankruptcy ruling Lakusta considers unfavorable. *See In re Alexis Mager Lakusta*, C 06-03431-SBA (filed May 26, 2006); *Lakusta v. Evans et al*, C 06-06105-PJH (filed September 29, 2006); *Lakusta v. US Trustee*, C 07-00227-SBA (filed January 12, 2007); *Lakusta v. Simms*, 07-05161-JSW (filed October 9, 2007).

The instant bankruptcy appeal appears to be the fourth of five cases that debtor Alexis Mager

The initial bankruptcy appeal was dismissed without prejudice by this Court because, after being granted two extensions to file his opening brief, Lakusta failed to perfect the record and filed an unintelligible opening brief. *See In re Alexis Mager Lakusta*, C 06-03431-SBA, Docket No. 25. In *Lakusta v. US Trustee*, C 07-00227-SBA, the Court denied Lakusta's "emergency" request to place the briefing schedule on hold in that action and ordered Lakusta to file an opening brief by July 16, 2007, or be prepared to show cause why the case should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute. *See Lakusta v. US Trustee*, C 07-00227-SBA, Docket Nos. 21 & 22. Because Lakusta failed to file an opening brief, that case was dismissed for failure to prosecute on September 25, 2007.

¹See In re Lakusta, 2007 WL 2255230 (N.D. Cal. August 3, 2007) (affirming bankruptcy court's September 8, 2006 order in adversary case no. 03-3549 TC (Chapter 7 case no. 02-31521 STC) declaring Lakusta a vexatious litigant).

6

8

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

24

25

On November 6, 2007 – nearly five months after this case was initially filed – the Court ordered Lakusta to file an opening brief by no later than December 5, 2007. Specifically in light of Lakusta's repeated history of requesting extensions to file opening briefs, the order unambiguously stated: "If appellant fails to file a brief by this date, this case will be dismissed for failure to prosecute." See Docket No. 14 at 1 (emphasis in original).

True to form, rather than file an opening brief, and in direct violation of this Court's order, on December 5, 2007, Lakusta filed an "Application for Extension of Time to File Opening Brief," "Judge Armstrong's order not withstanding." Docket No. 15 at 1. The gravamen of this motion appears to be that Lakusta has so multiplied the proceedings related to the underlying bankruptcy case (he has, by his own tally, one appeal pending before the California Court of Appeal, two appeals pending before this Court, and two appeals pending before the United States Court of Appeals for Ninth Circuit) that he cannot keep up with the briefing schedule in all of them. However, while Lakusta states that "an extension of time to file and serve his opening brief in this appeal is not unreasonable in light of the concurrent filing deadlines in immediately related cases," Lakusta identifies no such "concurrent filing deadlines," and, in any case, Lakusta was afforded nearly six months from the date he filed the instant appeal to file an opening brief.

Despite the Court's admonition that if he failed to timely file an opening brief this case would be dismissed, Lakusta failed to timely file an opening brief. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the judgment of the Bankruptcy Court is AFFIRMED. Lakusta's bankruptcy appeal is dismissed, this time WITH PREJUDICE. The Clerk shall close the file and terminate any pending matters.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

23

Dated: 1/10/08

United States District Judge

26

27

1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE
3	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
4	IN RE: ALEXIS MAGER LAKUSTA,
5	Case Number: CV07-03085 SBA Plaintiff,
6	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE v.
7	IN RE: ALEXIS MAGER LAKUSTA et al,
8	Defendant.
9	
10	I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California.
11	
12	That on January 10, 2008, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing said copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositing
13	said envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery receptace located in the Clerk's office.
14	U.S. Bankruptcy Court, No. District of CA (San Francisco)
15 Clerk's Office	
16	P.O. Box 7341 San Francisco, CA 94120-7341
17	U.S. Trustee
18	Office of the U.S. Trustee/SF
19	235 Pine Street San Francisco, CA 94104
20	Alexis Mager Lakusta 1259 El Camino Real #245
21	Menlo Park, CA 94025
22	Thomas E. Coulson
23	Thomas E. Carlson U.S. Bankruptcy Judge
24	USBC-San Francisco 235 Pine St
25	P.O. Box 7341 San Francisco, CA 94104
26	Data di January 10, 2009
27	Dated: January 10, 2008 Richard W. Wieking, Clerk
28	By: LISA R CLARK, Deputy Clerk

4 IN RE

No. C 07-03085 SBA

ALEXIS MAGER LAKUSTA,

ORDER

Debtor.

Lakusta, who has been declared a vexatious litigant by the bankruptcy court, has filed in federal district court since May of 2006, all of which appear to arise from, in one fashion or another, an underlying bankruptcy ruling Lakusta considers unfavorable. *See In re Alexis Mager Lakusta*, C 06-03431-SBA (filed May 26, 2006); *Lakusta v. Evans et al*, C 06-06105-PJH (filed September 29, 2006); *Lakusta v. US Trustee*, C 07-00227-SBA (filed January 12, 2007); *Lakusta v. Simms*, 07-05161-JSW (filed October 9, 2007).

The instant bankruptcy appeal appears to be the fourth of five cases that debtor Alexis Mager

The initial bankruptcy appeal was dismissed without prejudice by this Court because, after being granted two extensions to file his opening brief, Lakusta failed to perfect the record and filed an unintelligible opening brief. *See In re Alexis Mager Lakusta*, C 06-03431-SBA, Docket No. 25. In *Lakusta v. US Trustee*, C 07-00227-SBA, the Court denied Lakusta's "emergency" request to place the briefing schedule on hold in that action and ordered Lakusta to file an opening brief by July 16, 2007, or be prepared to show cause why the case should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute. *See Lakusta v. US Trustee*, C 07-00227-SBA, Docket Nos. 21 & 22. Because Lakusta failed to file an opening brief, that case was dismissed for failure to prosecute on September 25, 2007.

¹See In re Lakusta, 2007 WL 2255230 (N.D. Cal. August 3, 2007) (affirming bankruptcy court's September 8, 2006 order in adversary case no. 03-3549 TC (Chapter 7 case no. 02-31521 STC) declaring Lakusta a vexatious litigant).

6

8

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

24

25

On November 6, 2007 – nearly five months after this case was initially filed – the Court ordered Lakusta to file an opening brief by no later than December 5, 2007. Specifically in light of Lakusta's repeated history of requesting extensions to file opening briefs, the order unambiguously stated: "If appellant fails to file a brief by this date, this case will be dismissed for failure to prosecute." See Docket No. 14 at 1 (emphasis in original).

True to form, rather than file an opening brief, and in direct violation of this Court's order, on December 5, 2007, Lakusta filed an "Application for Extension of Time to File Opening Brief," "Judge Armstrong's order not withstanding." Docket No. 15 at 1. The gravamen of this motion appears to be that Lakusta has so multiplied the proceedings related to the underlying bankruptcy case (he has, by his own tally, one appeal pending before the California Court of Appeal, two appeals pending before this Court, and two appeals pending before the United States Court of Appeals for Ninth Circuit) that he cannot keep up with the briefing schedule in all of them. However, while Lakusta states that "an extension of time to file and serve his opening brief in this appeal is not unreasonable in light of the concurrent filing deadlines in immediately related cases," Lakusta identifies no such "concurrent filing deadlines," and, in any case, Lakusta was afforded nearly six months from the date he filed the instant appeal to file an opening brief.

Despite the Court's admonition that if he failed to timely file an opening brief this case would be dismissed, Lakusta failed to timely file an opening brief. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the judgment of the Bankruptcy Court is AFFIRMED. Lakusta's bankruptcy appeal is dismissed, this time WITH PREJUDICE. The Clerk shall close the file and terminate any pending matters.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

23

Dated: 1/10/08

United States District Judge

26

27

1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE
3	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
4	IN RE: ALEXIS MAGER LAKUSTA,
5	Case Number: CV07-03085 SBA Plaintiff,
6	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE v.
7	IN RE: ALEXIS MAGER LAKUSTA et al,
8	Defendant.
9	
10	I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California.
11	
12	That on January 10, 2008, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing said copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositing
13	said envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery receptace located in the Clerk's office.
14	U.S. Bankruptcy Court, No. District of CA (San Francisco)
15 Clerk's Office	
16	P.O. Box 7341 San Francisco, CA 94120-7341
17	U.S. Trustee
18	Office of the U.S. Trustee/SF
19	235 Pine Street San Francisco, CA 94104
20	Alexis Mager Lakusta 1259 El Camino Real #245
21	Menlo Park, CA 94025
22	Thomas E. Coulson
23	Thomas E. Carlson U.S. Bankruptcy Judge
24	USBC-San Francisco 235 Pine St
25	P.O. Box 7341 San Francisco, CA 94104
26	Data di January 10, 2009
27	Dated: January 10, 2008 Richard W. Wieking, Clerk
28	By: LISA R CLARK, Deputy Clerk

4 IN RE

No. C 07-03085 SBA

ALEXIS MAGER LAKUSTA,

ORDER

Debtor.

Lakusta, who has been declared a vexatious litigant by the bankruptcy court, has filed in federal district court since May of 2006, all of which appear to arise from, in one fashion or another, an underlying bankruptcy ruling Lakusta considers unfavorable. *See In re Alexis Mager Lakusta*, C 06-03431-SBA (filed May 26, 2006); *Lakusta v. Evans et al*, C 06-06105-PJH (filed September 29, 2006); *Lakusta v. US Trustee*, C 07-00227-SBA (filed January 12, 2007); *Lakusta v. Simms*, 07-05161-JSW (filed October 9, 2007).

The instant bankruptcy appeal appears to be the fourth of five cases that debtor Alexis Mager

The initial bankruptcy appeal was dismissed without prejudice by this Court because, after being granted two extensions to file his opening brief, Lakusta failed to perfect the record and filed an unintelligible opening brief. *See In re Alexis Mager Lakusta*, C 06-03431-SBA, Docket No. 25. In *Lakusta v. US Trustee*, C 07-00227-SBA, the Court denied Lakusta's "emergency" request to place the briefing schedule on hold in that action and ordered Lakusta to file an opening brief by July 16, 2007, or be prepared to show cause why the case should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute. *See Lakusta v. US Trustee*, C 07-00227-SBA, Docket Nos. 21 & 22. Because Lakusta failed to file an opening brief, that case was dismissed for failure to prosecute on September 25, 2007.

¹See In re Lakusta, 2007 WL 2255230 (N.D. Cal. August 3, 2007) (affirming bankruptcy court's September 8, 2006 order in adversary case no. 03-3549 TC (Chapter 7 case no. 02-31521 STC) declaring Lakusta a vexatious litigant).

6

8

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

24

25

On November 6, 2007 – nearly five months after this case was initially filed – the Court ordered Lakusta to file an opening brief by no later than December 5, 2007. Specifically in light of Lakusta's repeated history of requesting extensions to file opening briefs, the order unambiguously stated: "If appellant fails to file a brief by this date, this case will be dismissed for failure to prosecute." See Docket No. 14 at 1 (emphasis in original).

True to form, rather than file an opening brief, and in direct violation of this Court's order, on December 5, 2007, Lakusta filed an "Application for Extension of Time to File Opening Brief," "Judge Armstrong's order not withstanding." Docket No. 15 at 1. The gravamen of this motion appears to be that Lakusta has so multiplied the proceedings related to the underlying bankruptcy case (he has, by his own tally, one appeal pending before the California Court of Appeal, two appeals pending before this Court, and two appeals pending before the United States Court of Appeals for Ninth Circuit) that he cannot keep up with the briefing schedule in all of them. However, while Lakusta states that "an extension of time to file and serve his opening brief in this appeal is not unreasonable in light of the concurrent filing deadlines in immediately related cases," Lakusta identifies no such "concurrent filing deadlines," and, in any case, Lakusta was afforded nearly six months from the date he filed the instant appeal to file an opening brief.

Despite the Court's admonition that if he failed to timely file an opening brief this case would be dismissed, Lakusta failed to timely file an opening brief. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the judgment of the Bankruptcy Court is AFFIRMED. Lakusta's bankruptcy appeal is dismissed, this time WITH PREJUDICE. The Clerk shall close the file and terminate any pending matters.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

23

Dated: 1/10/08

United States District Judge

26

27

1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE
3	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
4	IN RE: ALEXIS MAGER LAKUSTA,
5	Case Number: CV07-03085 SBA Plaintiff,
6	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE v.
7	IN RE: ALEXIS MAGER LAKUSTA et al,
8	Defendant.
9	
10	I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California.
11	
12	That on January 10, 2008, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing said copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositing
13	said envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery receptace located in the Clerk's office.
14	U.S. Bankruptcy Court, No. District of CA (San Francisco)
15 Clerk's Office	
16	P.O. Box 7341 San Francisco, CA 94120-7341
17	U.S. Trustee
18	Office of the U.S. Trustee/SF
19	235 Pine Street San Francisco, CA 94104
20	Alexis Mager Lakusta 1259 El Camino Real #245
21	Menlo Park, CA 94025
22	Thomas E. Carlson
23	Thomas E. Carlson U.S. Bankruptcy Judge
24	USBC-San Francisco 235 Pine St
25	P.O. Box 7341 San Francisco, CA 94104
26	Data di January 10, 2009
27	Dated: January 10, 2008 Richard W. Wieking, Clerk
28	By: LISA R CLARK, Deputy Clerk